

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the October 18, 2006 Final Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C §§ 102 and 103

Claims 4-6, 9-11 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,496,979 issued to Chen, et al. The rejection asserts that Chen allegedly teaches each element of the claims.

The claims as amended are directed toward uninstalling applications on a wireless device in response to a remote recall command, wherein the uninstalling of the applications do not require end-user interaction. The recall command determines whether one or applications on the wireless device should be uninstalled.

None of the cited art teaches or suggests receiving a remote recall command over the wireless network. This allows the identification and removal of the applications to be controlled by someone other than the end-user. Applications may need to be uninstalled for a variety of reasons, and these can be monitored and determined by persons or entities involved with the development and/or issuance of the program and/or those involved with the function of the wireless network (see specification, paragraph 0010 and 0011). Thus, in the present invention, a network operator can determine that a program needs to be uninstalled (which can be for a variety of reasons as described in the specification). The network operator can then issue the uninstall command, which will be remotely received by the wireless device upon boot-up and communication with the wireless network without any end-user interaction.

Chen only teaches connecting a wireless device to a computer and uninstalling applications based on instructions from the user. . However, Chen is based on the end-user launching an application management program 12, similar to using the application install/uninstall feature of a desktop computer such as through the control panel of Microsoft Windows. Thus, the user can then select the programs to load or unload. No remote uninstall command is ever sent, and everything done by Chen involves end-user interaction.

Further, Claim 10 requires maintaining a database for identifying each application installed on each wireless device of said set; searching said database to identify said subset of wireless devices having said specific application installed; and sending an application recall command to each wireless device in said subset. Thus, the server can remotely issue a recall command to each wireless device in the subset, thus removing an application from each wireless device with one command transmission. Although the rejection states that Chen teaches each element of Claim 10, a review of the cited sections of Chen shows that Chen never teaches or suggests anything close to maintaining a database of a set of wireless devices and then issuing a recall command to each wireless device in a subset as claimed. Chen simply teaches a single user interacting with a single wireless device. Chen does not teach or suggest maintaining such a database or issuing recall commands to multiple wireless devices in a subset.

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 4, 10, and 25 are patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4, 10, and 25 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 4, 10, and 25.

Claims 5-6, 9, 11, and 20-24 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 4, 10, and 25, Applicants

respectfully submit that Claims 5-6, 9, 11, and 20-24 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 5-6, 9, 11, and 20-24.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated December 18, 2006

By: /James T. Hagler/

James T. Hagler

Reg. No. 40,631

(858) 651-0266

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
Attn: Patent Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-1714  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502